IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

DAVID ANTHONY McKINNEY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
N/O)	CIVIL NO. 07-495-GPM
VS.)	CIVIL NO. 07-493-GI WI
ALBERTO GONZELES, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

MURPHY, District Judge:

On September 6, 2007, the Court directed Plaintiff to either pay the \$350 filing fee for this action or file a properly supported motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 3). Instead of complying with that order, Plaintiff has filed a response (Doc. 4) explaining that he has no funds and that he does not even have the postage to file such a motion. Ironically, though, Plaintiff states that he was able to borrow postage from a fellow inmate in order to mail this response. This begs the question – if Plaintiff was able to borrow postage to file this response to a court order, why could he not borrow postage to file an *in forma pauperis* motion as directed by the Court? Giving him the benefit of the doubt, the Court will give him additional time to do just that.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within THIRTY (30) DAYS of the date of the entry of this order, Plaintiff shall pay the \$350 filing fee applicable to this action. In the alternative, Plaintiff may file a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, supported by a certified copy of his prison trust fund account statement for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint and an affidavit that includes a statement of his assets. Plaintiff is **ADVISED** that in the event he has

been transferred among institutions during this six-month period, it is Plaintiff's responsibility to

obtain a copy of his prison trust account statement from each such facility and to forward it to the

Court. Plaintiff is **FURTHER ADVISED** that his obligation to pay the filing fee for this action was

incurred at the time the action was filed; such an obligation will exist whether or not Plaintiff is

granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1); see also Lucien v. Jockisch,

133 F.3d 464, 467 (7th Cir. 1998).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that upon conclusion of this thirty-day period, should

Plaintiff fail to comply with this order, this case will be closed for failure to comply with an order

of this Court. FED.R.CIV.P. 41(b); see generally Ladien v. Astrachan, 128 F.3d 1051 (7th Cir. 1997);

Johnson v. Kamminga, 34 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 1994).

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to provide Plaintiff with a sufficient number of *in forma pauperis*

motion forms to enable him to comply with this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/16/07

G. Patrick Murphy

United States District Judge

s/ G. Patrick Murphy

Page 2 of 2